REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 11. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case in view of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,389,460 issued to Stewart ("*Stewart*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Stewart* does not anticipate independent Claim 1 because *Stewart* does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every claim limitation of independent Claim 1. For example, Claim 1 recites, "comparing the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion to transform criteria to identify a specific transform ..., the specific transform defining an action to perform on the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion," and "performing the action to combine information from the header portion and the first uniform resource identifier to yield the second uniform resource identifier."

Nowhere in *Stewart* are these limitations disclosed, taught, or suggested. As stated at column 11, lines 29-35 of *Stewart*, "desired data is stored as a series of nested directories . . . [that] are formed using a combination of the URL, cookies and authorization. As a result, the URL, cookies and authorizations are all encoded and cached." Furthermore, FIG. 5 of *Stewart* expounds on this concept by describing a slot creation process in which "an image identification string is formed . . . by concatenating the URL, the merged cookies and the authorizations that have been obtained by earlier processing operations of the slot creation processing 500." The image identification string is hashed and encoded before being "divided to form a directory path." "[T]he encoded image identification string is divided up into several pieces that form a series of directories which are referred to as a directory path." (See *Stewart*, col. 8, line 4 through col. 9, line 47). In addition, "[a] representative structure for a slot for Internet applications is provided in Table 1" in *Stewart*. (*Stewart*, col. 17, line 64 to col. 18, line 10).

9

Thus, *Stewart* may associate a URL, cookies, and authorizations in some nested directory manner, but *Stewart* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest comparing an original URL and the header portion to transform criteria to identify a specific transform, where the specific transform defines an action to perform on the original URL and the header portion. *Stewart* also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest performing the action to combine information from the header portion and the first uniform resource identifier to yield the second uniform resource identifier.

Thus, *Stewart* does not teach each and every claim limitation of Claim 1 and, hence, does not anticipate independent Claim 1. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2-10 are also not anticipated by *Stewart* because they include the limitations of independent Claim 1 as well as additional limitations that further distinguish *Stewart*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection of these claims be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 11 is allowable for reasons analogous to those above in conjunction with Claim 1. Thus, *Stewart* does not anticipate independent Claim 11. In addition, dependent Claims 12-20 are also not anticipated by *Stewart* because they include limitations of independent Claim 11 as well as additional limitations that further distinguish *Stewart*. Therefore, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

10

CONCLUSIONS

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicant believes no fee is currently due. However, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. **02-0384** of **Baker Botts L.L.P.**

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant

Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460
PHONE: (214) 953-6494

Date: _January 6, 2004_

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**
Attorney Docket No.:   066241.0111